

**Measure C Citizens Oversight Committee Meeting
Monday May 12th, 2008 4:00pm- Lobby Conference Room, Tahoe Forest Hospital**

Members present: Mark Tanner, Paul Leyton, Sherrin Fielder, Randy Hill, Leisa Peterson, Gary Davis, Caroline Ford

Staff present: Rick McConn, Evangeline Van Skyhawk, Maia Schneider

Guests present: Bob Schapper, Steve Gross, John Gillengerten-OSHPD

Attachment #1 Proposed Final Bylaws
Attachment #2 Meeting minutes 4/21/08
Attachment #3 OSHPD Presentation

Topic/Agenda	Finding/Conclusions	Recommendations/Action and Responsible Party
I. Called to order at 4:08pm		
II. Roll Call	<i>Please see above</i>	
III. Clear the Agenda/Items Not On The Posted Agenda	District Board meeting scheduled for the 27th of May. Planning committee is the 19th of May.	
	Communications working budget is expected to be \$20-25k. This comes from District operations funds and not from the Foundation or any donations made to the Foundation.	
IV. Input-Audience	None	
V. Approval of Minutes	A vote was called and the minutes from 4/21/08 were approved unanimously.	Paul Leyton questioned the accuracy of section VII of the minutes. He felt that it had been discussed that it could be the role of the committee to be prospective as well as retrospective. Sherrin Fielder said that the term "Inquiry" should be used as a substitute for "review" as that was her intent in section VI of the minutes. See Attachment #2.
VI. OSHPD-John Gillengarten	Deputy Director for OSHPD made presentation on seismological regulations. Please refer to Attachment #3. There is a possibility of extending deadline for Hospital changes, this would require applying for the voluntary program. Mr. Gillengarten suggested using phased review for large projects, as it saves time and money. If application is submitted and under review, by the end of 2008, a two year extension may be granted, pursuant to bill SB1661 (drawings have to be accepted-cds in process) Contract reviewers are used on larger projects, so despite the increase in business, there hasn't been a huge increase of staff. Penalties for not making 2013 deadline include OSHPD notifying licensing and notification, they must then notify the state who will be required to suspend or not renew license. OSHPD is 100% fee supported, no general funds from the State. Fees are set in regulation and are 1.64% of construction cost. OSHPD is initiating the Baldrige system, and are in the process of mapping procedures. OSHPD is stable, but not really profit driven- \$4m loss this year, \$ 6m profit last year.	John will provide a copy of presentation for distribution to COC members. John has offered to meet with Health System representatives if they are interested in the SB1661. John to contact Bob Schapper as to sharing info on the Baldrige process.
	OSHPD is part of the Ca Department of Health Services, and is accountable to the executive branch-Governors office. Randy Hill made an observation as to business strategy; by understaffing, jobs take longer to complete but make the company more profitable.	
	Goal of OSHPD is that Healthcare be available to all CA, therefore that safe buildings get built. Identify waste (time) and eliminate it. BIMS-helps to identify clashes virtually before they become real.	

VII. Facilities Development Update-Rick McConn	Board has selected a master planner-Freeman and White. Approach is strategic business planning standpoint. Meeting this Thursday, with John Huddy to come up with the overall schedule for the planning initiatives; will get findings out to everyone. Selection of architect is critical. Freeman and White might be under consideration for that as well. Huddy has had some experience with Cancer Centers, ERs and OSHPD.	
VIII. Bylaws Review	Outcome of last meeting was to potentially strike the two subparagraphs in question. Meeting between Hill, Maia Schneider, Bob Schapper and Roger Kahn occurred since last COC meeting. The consensus of that meeting was that the current wording is ambiguous and potentially susceptible to over zealous interpretation, and does not appear to be consistent with direction of District Board. Hill stated the Committee can make a recommendation to make changes. Hill proposed 1)striking sec 2(4) and sec 4(3.3)(d), from the Bylaws, and would ask for a second motion and vote for new language to insert. Leyton suggested combining the two motions. Hill felt that in the interest of moving forward it would be better to keep them separate. A discussion on the merits of two motions versus one followed.	
	Hill asked the COC to each state their thought as to the Bylaws. Leisa Peterson wanted to strike #4. Fielder felt wording was confusing, and alternative wording should be selected; striking without changing is also ambiguous. Caroline Ford stated the committee needed clarity as to what we can do as well as can't do, what is the intent. She agrees with Peterson that if it's not in the GO Bond ballot language it should be struck. Gary Davis felt that the committee could be held accountable for things they are not qualified to decide, based on language. Leyton felt it wasn't fair to the community to put off changing the language after striking the current language. Mark Tanner suggested to keep it as is, or get rid of it completely. Role should be oversight not advisory. Hill-any recommendation is strictly a suggestion, by striking the COC can also ask Board to find other language. There was also discussion as to the benefits of listing certain language to outline the things the COC is not responsible for.	
	COC members felt it was important to clarify that they are not responsible for maximizing bond revenue, and that there is a difference between that and reviewing cost management. The reason the Board chose to have a COC was to provide confidence to the community that the Health System is doing what they should be with the 98.5 M they have received. Schapper stated that the District Board wants the community to trust that the Health system is a good steward of the taxpayers' money. Steve Gross suggested changing language to, "Consider the District's good faith best efforts to be the good stewards of the bond revenue."	
	Leyton motioned to make a recommendation to the District board as Gross worded it. Peterson seconded. Additional discussion ensued- this would be changing not striking the current language. Tanner was not comfortable with the motion, or any substitute language at this point. Tanner stated that suggestions for changes could be made at any time. Hill indicated discomfort, will still be open ended and ambiguous and recommended that language should simply be struck. Ford suggested having a subcommittee to put together proposal of changes, for next meeting. Leyton restated motion to make a recommendation to the board that the language in 2(4) 4(d) be changed to reflect Gross's suggestion. Second stood. Ayes: Leyton, Fielder, Davis and Peterson. Nays: Ford, Hill, Tanner. Motion failed (requires 2/3 vote). Schapper suggested making a motion that recommends exactly what COC already stated: the Bylaws are vague and need clarification, to the Board. Leyton motioned, Peterson seconded to strike section 2(4) 4(d) from Bylaws subject to the District Board developing language jointly with the	
	COC or COC designee that more clearly reflects the duties of the committee. Discussion ensued-Tanner reiterated that it's fine to simply take this language out. A COC member called for the vote. Motion passed unanimously.	
IX. Communications	Communications was tabled to the next meeting.	
X. Next Scheduled Meeting- 6/09/08		

Meeting adjourned at 6:30pm